

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION TWO

In re C.P. et al., Persons Coming Under
the Juvenile Court Law.

SAN BERNARDINO COUNTY
CHILDREN AND FAMILY SERVICES,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

A.B.,

Defendant and Appellant.

E071980

(Super.Ct.Nos. J277663 &
J277664)

OPINION

APPEAL from the Superior Court of San Bernardino County. Erin K. Alexander,
Judge. Affirmed.

Tracy M. De Soto, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and
Appellant.

Michelle D. Blakemore, County Counsel, and Jamila Bayati, Deputy County
Counsel, for Plaintiff and Respondent.

I

INTRODUCTION

A.B. (Mother) is the mother of two boys: 11-year-old G.P. and seven-year-old C.P. The children were removed from parental custody following allegations of general neglect. Mother appeals from the juvenile court's jurisdictional and dispositional findings and orders over her sons. Mother requests this court's review of only a portion of the jurisdictional allegations pertaining to her conduct even though independent, unchallenged bases exist for the court's dependency jurisdiction over the children. She argues (1) the court erred in sustaining the jurisdictional findings against her regarding allegations of substance abuse and an unkempt home; and (2) the court erred in removing the children from her custody.¹ We find no error and affirm the judgment.

II

FACTUAL AND PROCEDURAL BACKGROUND

A. *Family History*

Mother and Father met in 2007 and lived in Phelan, California. G.P. was born in 2007, and C.P. in 2011. Mother was raised by her parents and completed high school. She indicated her mother was mentally ill and tried to kill her. Mother was 31 years old when the current dependency was initiated. She was unemployed but worked in a donut shop when they needed the help. Father's mother died when he was very young, leaving his alcoholic father to raise him. Father was eventually placed in foster care. Father

¹ The children's father, D.P. (Father), is not a party to this appeal.

dropped out of high school and stated he could not work because he had a cyst in his head that leaked but he occasionally worked odd jobs.

The family was known to the San Bernardino County Children and Family Services (CFS). In 2011, CFS received a general neglect and emotional abuse referral alleging the parents used and sold methamphetamine in the presence of the children. The referral also stated that Mother hit Father while he held one of the children. The referral was closed as unfounded because the home appeared neat and clean and there was no indication the parents used or sold drugs from the home.

From 2017 to 2018, CFS received two more referrals concerning the family. An April 2017 referral alleged that the children and the home were filthy, the family barely had food, Father abused alcohol, and Mother had a history of abusing methamphetamine. An April 2018 referral alleged that the children were dirty and were often hungry. Both of those referrals were closed as unfounded/inconclusive because CFS was unable to locate the family, and the family had never allowed access to the property or to the children.

B. Current Dependency

On August 22, 2018, CFS received another referral alleging general neglect of the children. The referral alleged that on August 17, 2018, G.P. was sent home from school due to a suspicion he had scabies. The referral also stated that G.P. was ““filthy”” and eating as if he was starving. School personnel tried to visit the family, but the home was effectively a fortress with a locked gate. School officials left voicemails for Mother

asking her to contact the school, but had not seen or talked to any family members. The paternal great-grandmother picked the children up from school because the parents could not be contacted. The paternal great-grandmother was informed that G.P. required medical clearance before returning to school. School officials noted the children often came to school dirty and hungry, and G.P. reported to the school counselor that the family home did not have running water.

A criminal history search for both parents revealed that the parents had been arrested and charged with drug offenses. Mother was charged with possession of methamphetamine in 2006 and 2010, under the influence of a controlled substance in 2007, and a failure to follow the Education Code concerning attendance of a child in March 2018. Father was a fugitive as of 2008 for failing to complete a drug diversion program, and he had a 2009 under the influence charge.

On August 24, 2018, a social worker visited the family home, but could not access the property because it was fenced and gated with a padlock. The yard was littered with debris and the home looked dilapidated.

On August 27, 2018, CFS received a telephone call from a school counselor expressing concerns for C.P. and G.P. because the school had not seen the children or spoken to the parents for approximately 10 days. The counselor noted that school personnel had made several calls to Mother and had left voicemails each time requesting Mother call the school.

On August 29, 2018, a social worker visited the children's elementary school and met with school personnel. School personnel reported that the children had not been to school since August 17, 2018. The social worker also obtained a copy of the student conference records and the individualized education program (IEP) for G.P. The student conference records showed that in September 2016, the school counselor had met with Mother and G.P. to discuss G.P.'s hygiene and responsibility to come to school with a "clean face, body, clothes, and socks." In August 2017, school personnel telephoned Mother to share food resources. In January 2018, the school counselor met with G.P. to discuss hygiene and concerns at home, and telephoned Mother to determine what support was needed. G.P.'s IEP indicated that he was in the very low range for cognitive ability, phonological processing, and ability to comprehend what he was reading, and that his fluid reasoning was in the very low to below average range. In addition, G.P. wrote his numbers and letters backwards. The school's IEP team had attempted to reach Mother on three separate occasions, but Mother never contacted the school and did not attend the IEP meeting.

On August 29, 2018, the social worker made an unannounced visit to the family home and noted the property was surrounded by fencing and the gate was padlocked. The social worker observed a man walking in the yard and called out to him. The man never turned around to acknowledge the social worker but called out Mother's name. Mother exited a trailer and met the social worker at the gate. Mother was extremely dirty and foul smelling. The social worker asked Mother if she could interview the children

alone and if she could have access to the home. Mother replied “no.” She claimed she was getting ready to take the children to the doctor’s office and assured the social worker that the boys would return to school the next day with a doctor’s note. She, however, denied G.P. had a rash. Mother eventually allowed the social worker to see the children. G.P. had multiple bites and scabs, which Mother confirmed he had at school on August 17, 2018. She attributed G.P.’s condition to bedbugs on a couch she and Father removed from the home. She again denied the social worker’s request to see the home, claiming she was cleaning it and everything was all over the place. She also stated that a deputy had visited the home earlier that day and said “everything was fine.” Mother agreed to bring the children to the CFS office to be interviewed after their doctor’s appointment. However, she failed to appear for that appointment and did not call the social worker.

On August 30, 2018, the social worker received an email from the deputy who had visited the parents’ residence the prior day. The deputy stated that he had been called to the home to conduct a welfare check but was not granted permission to access the property. Instead, Mother brought the children to the fence to speak with the deputy. On this same day, school officials informed the social worker that the children still had not returned to school, nor had they provided any excuse for their absences.

Thereafter, on August 30, 2018, the social worker obtained a warrant permitting her to interview the children and have access to the family home in order to assess it. Accordingly, on this same day, the social worker, along with a deputy, executed the

warrant. Father was home, and stated Mother and the children were not at home but at the doctor's office. When the social worker informed Father that Mother had stated she had a doctor's appointment the previous day, Father stated Mother "got the days mixed up." He allowed the social worker into the home only because she had a warrant. Father acknowledged Mother was supposed to bring the boys to the CFS office. He claimed Mother could not keep the appointment and had sent an email to the social worker. The social worker, however, was not able to locate any emails from Mother.

Upon entry into the home, the social worker immediately smelled an unpleasant odor. The social worker also noticed the home was dilapidated and unsanitary. Trash and clothing was strewn about in the home and yard. Father stated the boys slept on a sofa and the parents slept on a blow-up mattress in the living room. The home had no working utilities or running water. The water company had removed the meter after the homeowner passed away. Father claimed he leased the home, but could not produce a lease, nor did he know whose name was on the utilities account. He stated the home was bank-owned, and the bank allowed them to live there, although they paid no rent. The social worker spoke with a water company employee who told her the home was a bank "repo" that had no water since July 2017 and that water meters are removed when there are "squatters on the property." Father noted that he had a water tank in which he stored water so the family could bathe and use the restroom.

The social worker thereafter obtained a warrant to detain the children and returned to the home. Mother and the children were still not present, and Father stated Mother had

taken the children to the doctor's office and was unsure what time Mother would arrive home. Father allowed the social worker access into the home and said he had been cleaning the home all day. The kitchen counter, the bathtub, and bathroom vanity appeared to be cleared and cleaned. Mother arrived home a short time later. The social worker noted the children were sitting in the backseat of Mother's vehicle and C.P. was not lawfully restrained. Mother was upset and crying as she spoke with the deputy. She also began yelling at the social worker, arguing she had not abused or neglected the children. She showed the social worker prescription medication for G.P. to prove she had taken G.P. to the doctor, and a doctor's note excusing the children from school from August 30 to September 4, 2018. The children, however, had not been in school since August 17, 2018.

The boys were interviewed at the CFS office. C.P. appeared "disheveled, shabby, unsanitary and dirty." He stated the family had resided at the home "[a] long time" and he "sometimes" took a bath in the garage, as the family had a "water tank." He did not use soap, and he wore the same clothes for several days. G.P. stated he had not showered "in a long time," he did not brush his teeth because they had no water, and he wore the same clothes a couple days in a row. G.P. also asserted they had plenty of food to eat, but also admitted there were days he went without food. He explained that his parents were unemployed and that they received money from metal scraps they found in the desert. The boys were taken into protective custody and placed with the paternal

great-grandmother. The social worker took photographs reflecting the condition of the family home and yard.

On September 4, 2018, petitions were filed on behalf of the children pursuant to section 300, subdivisions (b) (failure to protect) and (j) (abuse of sibling). The subdivision (b) allegations stated: (1-2) the parents had histories of substance abuse that impaired their ability to provide adequate care and supervision for the children; (3) on or around August 30, 2018, the parents' residence was observed to have a strong unpleasant odor, miscellaneous trash items on the kitchen countertops, floor, and throughout the home; the home was dilapidated and unsanitary; the home had little to no food; and the home had no working utilities. The subdivision (j) allegations stated that the parents failed to obtain medical treatment for G.P. in a timely manner and therefore C.P. was at risk of suffering medical neglect while in parental care.²

The detention hearing was held on September 5, 2018. The parents were present, and Mother's counsel asked for "immediate referrals." The juvenile court formally detained the children from parental custody and ordered supervised visits and pre-dispositional services for the parents. The court also ordered the parents to drug test that day. Father stated he and Mother had no identification, and the court assured they would be photographed and could test. The court advised the parents that failure to test would be deemed a positive result.

² At the jurisdictional/dispositional hearing, the court attempted to resolve the case by agreeing to strike the language in the petition stating the home had little to no food and working utilities, and dismissing the subdivision (j) allegations.

CFS recommended that the juvenile court find true the allegations in the petitions, declare the children dependents of the court, and order reunification services for the parents with supervised visits.

Mother claimed the allegations in the petitions were not true. She stated the boys were sent home from school with an “‘unknown rash,’” not caused by scabies, but from bedbug bites. She also asserted that their family doctor was on vacation and the office had no appointments until August 30, 2018, and that she inadvertently went to the doctor the day before the appointment date. She went to an urgent care clinic but was turned away as she lacked identification. The parents claimed the children’s absences were excused. However, school records indicated the boys had numerous trancies, and proceedings were initiated against the parents for G.P.

The family’s doctor and staff confirmed the boys were seen at the doctor’s office on August 30, 2019, but without appointments, as walk-ins. The staff also reported that the doctor had not been on vacation as Mother claimed and that, if the doctor had been on vacation, a physician’s assistant would see patients.

The parents explained Father’s 2007 conviction for being under the influence of methamphetamine was due to him being in “‘the wrong place at the wrong time.’” However, on September 5, 2018, he failed to show for his court-ordered drug test, and later claimed he did not know he was supposed to test. Mother called the substance abuse allegation “a lie,” and claimed she had never used drugs or been arrested for drugs. She also missed the September 5, 2018 drug test. She claimed the testing center asked

for her “color” to test, which confused her, so she did not test. Mother also contended the court did not inform her of that test. When asked if she was willing to drug test, Mother stated that she was “not willing to drug test” and did not think she should have to. Mother’s criminal record indicates that her 2006 drug charge was dismissed, but she was convicted of a related petty theft offense. She also had an active warrant relating to traffic violations. The children denied seeing their parents using drugs.

Concerning the family home, the parents stated they now had working utilities, and were remodeling. The home was painted, they had new flooring, there were no more bedbugs, and the children had beds. The family had a water storage tank with a pump. CFS staff found the home was improved, but it still had clutter, and took updated photographs of the home. Two photographs of the home revealed an empty bottle of vodka on the kitchen counter.

On September 12, 2018, CFS interviewed the children at their placement home. G.P. reported he was doing well but wanted to return to his parents. G.P. acknowledged “barely” having food, but stated his mom would “sell stuff to go get more food.” G.P.’s friends were not permitted at the home, because Father feared trespassers would steal from them. G.P. did not sleep in his room because “there was too much poop in there,” and his parents could not sleep in their room because of rats.

On September 18, 2018, CFS staff interviewed C.P. at school. He reported he liked living with the paternal great-grandmother because “there is food and water.” He described his home as “very dirty.”

The social worker reported the parents made minimal attempts to clean the home. They intended to have a yard sale, but their home remained cluttered. It took them two weeks to obtain medical attention for the boys, and their claims were inconsistent with what the doctor's office reported. The parents evidently failed to understand how the condition of their home impacted the boys' welfare. The boys were often tardy and truant from school. The parents denied abusing substances, but they refused to drug test. The social worker, therefore, concluded the children remained at risk in parental custody. The proposed case plans for the parents required general counseling, a parenting education program, substance abuse outpatient treatment, and random drug testing, and included objectives such as obtaining and maintaining a stable and suitable residence and complying with court orders.

Also on September 18, 2018, the parents were given the terms of their case plans, provided a referral resource guide, and advised to enroll in classes as soon as possible. The parents attended supervised visits, and they were attentive and appropriate with the boys. They completed a parenting course, but claimed they had trouble getting into substance abuse treatment. They continued to make improvements to the family home.

On October 22, 2018, the parents filed section 388 petitions with attached supporting documents, requesting return of the boys to their custody and dismissal of the case. They claimed information concerning Mother's criminal history, their drug charges, and the Education Code violation was a "lie" and was "falsified." Concerning G.P.'s rash, Mother provided an email to a school district attendance specialist, dated

August 28, 2018, in which she argued the boys simply had bug bites, but she still received the same “ignorant answer,” indicating she needed medical clearance for G.P. before G.P. could return to school. One of the section 388 petitions included attached photographs of the inside of the home, showing it had food, and was less cluttered. Another attachment indicated the parents received well water at their home on August 8, 2018. However, it was “[n]on-[p]otable.” The court deemed the section 388 petitions “premature” and denied them.

On October 22, and November 9, 2018, Mother failed to show for on-demand drug tests, and she did not produce a sufficient urine sample on October 26, 2018. These tests were all deemed positive results. Thus, including the September 5, 2018 no-show test, Mother had at least four drug tests that were deemed positive. As of October 25, 2018, the family home still had debris, such as broken glass, sharp metal scraps, and aged food containers inside and outside the home, although minor repairs were done inside. Father failed to show for a random drug test on November 8, 2018. However, his October 26, 2018 on-demand drug test was negative.

The contested jurisdictional/dispositional hearing was held on November 15, 2018. The juvenile court proposed a resolution, dismissal of allegations concerning G.P.’s medical treatment, and sustaining of other allegations. The parents, however, wished to proceed with a trial. The court received CFS reports into evidence and indicated it would consider the section 388 petitions. The court thereafter heard testimony from Father and Mother.

Father testified he had not used illegal substances since 2009. Concerning his missed court-ordered, on-demand drug test on September 5, 2018, he explained “our car broke down and there was no way we could get there.” Father also stated the family home no longer had a strong unpleasant odor or trash and other miscellaneous items, and the home had utilities. When asked whether he was ordered to do a drug diversion program related to his 2009 drug conviction, Father claimed he was not sure. Specifically, he asserted “I wasn’t a hundred percent [¶] . . . [¶] I went down and paid the money and peed and they never told me anything else.”

Mother testified “I’ve never done drugs. I’ve never been arrested for drugs. I don’t do drugs.” Regarding the September 5, 2018 on-demand drug test, contrary to Father’s testimony, Mother claimed the “lady in the front” gave them a list of where to go “and it said up top the color.” They told Mother to call the number. When she did, the facility asked for a color. “We didn’t have a color to give the people on the phone.” Mother stated that she had completed an online parenting course, and agreed to engage in counseling, but did not “fully agree” to a substance abuse program. However, she was “willing to do anything to get [her] kids back.” Mother also testified she was not sure whether she agreed with the allegation addressing her home, because they were remodeling to rid the home of bedbugs, and they remedied the issue.

The respective attorneys for the parents requested the court to dismiss the allegations in the petitions. However, counsel for the children and CFS’s counsel asked the court to sustain the petitions. Following argument, the juvenile court found the

failure to protect allegations in the petitions true as modified. The court, however, struck the language in the petitions stating the home had little to no food and no working utilities, and dismissed the subdivision (j) allegations concerning G.P.'s medical needs. The court explained that, while the parents' criminal history was dated, the court was "concerned regarding the lack of follow through regarding the court-ordered tests." The court did not "find the various rationales to be credible." In addition, the court noted that Father appeared to be "somewhat confused by the questions and slow in answering and difficult to understand," and Mother's "responses were rapid and sometimes with inappropriate laughter." The court explained that Mother's laughter "could be nervousness." However, it raised concerns, and "[t]he way to alleviate those concerns is to follow through with the drug testing." Given the parents' presentation in court, the condition of their home, their history, and failures to drug test, which were considered positive tests, the court found there were sufficient grounds to sustain the failure to protect allegations.

Thereafter, the court noted that it would require the parents to drug test, and if they missed any tests or tested positive from that day forward, they would be required to attend an outpatient treatment program. The court also authorized CFS to liberalize visits to unsupervised status in a neutral location if the parents produced three clean tests and did not miss any drug tests. Mother's counsel responded, "We would submit on that." The court then reiterated its proposal, removed the children from parental custody pursuant to section 361, subdivision (c)(1), declared the children dependents of the court,

and provided the parents with reunification services and supervised visits. This appeal followed.

III

DISCUSSION

Mother challenges the jurisdictional and dispositional findings, arguing there is insufficient evidence to support the juvenile court's jurisdiction under subdivision (b) of section 300 as to her and removal of the children from her custody. Mother does not challenge the sufficiency of the evidence supporting CFS's allegations as to Father concerning his history of substance abuse or the fact that the family home was unsuitable and unkempt. Nor does Mother challenge the court's dispositional findings relating to Father. For the reasons explained below, we reject Mother's contentions.

A. *Jurisdictional Findings*

The focus of dependency proceedings is on the protection of children. (*In re I.A.* (2011) 201 Cal.App.4th 1484, 1491-1492.) To acquire jurisdiction over a child, a juvenile court need only "find that one parent's conduct has created circumstances triggering section 300." (*In re I.A.*, at p. 1491.) "[I]t is commonly said that a jurisdictional finding involving one parent is "'good against both. More accurately, the minor is a dependent if the actions of either parent bring [the minor] within one of the statutory definitions of a dependent.'"" (*Id.* at p. 1492.) "'This accords with the purpose of a dependency proceeding, which is to protect the child, rather than prosecute the parent.'" (*In re X.S.* (2010) 190 Cal.App.4th 1154, 1161.) As a result, "an appellate

court may decline to address the evidentiary support for any remaining jurisdictional findings once a single finding has been found to be supported by the evidence.” (*In re I.A.*, at p. 1492; see *In re La Shonda B.* (1979) 95 Cal.App.3d 593, 599 [agency “is not required to prove two petitions, one against the mother and one against the father, in order for the court to properly sustain a petition [pursuant to section 300] or adjudicate a dependency”].)

Even if we considered reversing the jurisdictional finding as to Mother, the juvenile court would retain jurisdiction over the children based on the sustained, and unchallenged, allegations against Father. Therefore, Mother’s attack on the jurisdictional findings relative to her conduct alone is nonjusticiable. (*In re I.A.*, *supra*, 201 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1490-1491 [“An important requirement for justiciability is the availability of ‘effective’ relief—that is, the prospect of a remedy that can have a practical, tangible impact on the parties’ conduct or legal status.”].)

Furthermore, Mother has failed to persuade us that there is a valid reason to exercise our discretion to consider her appeal on the merits. Mother has not identified any likely prejudice she will suffer in future proceedings because of the jurisdictional findings against her. Citing *In re Drake M.* (2012) 211 Cal.App.4th 754, 763, the only thing she has to say on this point in her reply brief is: “The Courts have found a distinguish [*sic*] between being an offending and non-offending parent, and may have ‘far reaching implications with respect to future dependency proceedings’ and even Mother’s parental rights.” The citation to case law, without applying the law to the facts of this

case, does not support the proposition this court should consider Mother's appeal on the merits. Moreover, Mother's contention the jurisdictional findings against her will have "far-reaching implications" is speculative. Because Mother has not established any actual or threatened prejudice from the challenged jurisdictional findings, we decline to exercise our discretion to review them on the merits. (*In re I.A.*, *supra*, 201 Cal.App.4th at pp. 1493-1495.)

B. *Dispositional Findings*

Mother also challenges the juvenile court's dispositional order removing the children from her custody. She claims the evidence was insufficient to support a finding that the children would be in substantial danger without removal from Mother's care and that there were reasonable means to safely maintain the children with Mother.

Preliminarily, CFS argues that Mother has forfeited the challenge to the dispositional orders, including the children's removal from her custody. Under the circumstances of this case, we disagree with CFS. A reviewing court ordinarily will not consider a challenge to a lower court's ruling if an objection could have been, but was not, made below. (*In re S.B.* (2004) 32 Cal.4th 1287, 1293, superseded by statute on other grounds as stated in *In re S.J.* (2008) 167 Cal.App.4th 953, 962.) This rule is applicable in dependency matters, and its purpose is to encourage parties to bring errors to the attention of the juvenile court so that they may be corrected. (*Ibid.*) But here, Mother preserved her right to challenge the sufficiency of the evidence supporting the juvenile court's orders by requesting a contested jurisdictional/dispositional hearing and

wishing to proceed to trial after the parents' rejected the juvenile court's proposed resolution. "Sufficiency of the evidence has always been viewed as a question necessarily and inherently raised in every contested trial of any issue of fact, and requiring no further steps by the aggrieved party to be preserved for appeal.'

[Citations.]" (*In re Isabella F.* (2014) 226 Cal.App.4th 128, 136 [court found the mother did not forfeit her evidentiary challenge to the juvenile court's jurisdictional findings despite her attorney asking the juvenile court to take jurisdiction under section 300, subdivision (b) based on allegations related solely to the father].)

Nonetheless, we find there is substantial evidence to support the court's dispositional orders removing the children from her care.

Section 361, subdivision (c), permits the removal of a child from the physical custody of a parent with whom the child was residing when the dependency petition was filed if the juvenile court finds by clear and convincing evidence that "[t]here is or would be a substantial danger to the physical health, safety, protection, or physical or emotional well-being" of the child if he or she were returned home, and "there are no reasonable means by which the [child]'s physical health can be protected without removing" the child from the parent's custody. (§ 361, subd. (c)(1).) "A removal order is proper if based on proof of parental inability to provide proper care for the child and proof of a potential detriment to the child if he or she remains with the parent. [Citation.] 'The parent need not be dangerous and the minor need not have been actually harmed before removal is appropriate. The focus of the statute is on averting harm to the child.'

[Citation.] The [juvenile] court may consider a parent’s past conduct as well as present circumstances. [Citation.]” (*In re N.M.* (2011) 197 Cal.App.4th 159, 169-170.)

“The juvenile court has broad discretion to determine what would best serve and protect the child’s interest and to fashion a dispositional order in accordance with this discretion.” (*In re Jose M.* (1988) 206 Cal.App.3d 1098, 1103-1104.) An appellate court reviews a dispositional order removing a child from parental custody for substantial evidence bearing in mind the heightened clear and convincing burden of proof that is required to remove a child from a parent’s care. (*In re D.G.* (2012) 208 Cal.App.4th 1562, 1574; *In re J.K.* (2009) 174 Cal.App.4th 1426, 1433; *In re Kristin H.* (1996) 46 Cal.App.4th 1635, 1654.)

The evidence in this case was sufficient to support a finding that Mother’s conduct posed a substantial risk of harm to the children and that removal of the children from Mother’s custody was the only reasonable means to protect them from that harm. The record indicates that the parents failed to provide the children with adequate basic needs and failed to cooperate with orders to drug test. Although the parents had made improvements to the family home, substantial evidence nonetheless demonstrates Mother refused to cooperate with the court orders to drug test. (See *In re A.K.* (2016) 246 Cal.App.4th 281, 285-286 [parent’s failure to cooperate with agency’s investigation or dependency proceedings bars parent’s challenge to removal order].) The record also demonstrates that the parents failed to ensure the children attended school and avoided contact with school officials, which increases the risk of neglect and avoids contact with

mandated reporters. In addition, Mother did not address G.P.'s medical needs and unsuitable living conditions until CFS was involved in the case. Even thereafter, Mother defied the on-demand drug testing orders. Based on the totality of the evidence, the juvenile court reasonably could find that Mother's conduct posed a substantial continuing risk of harm to the children and that such risk could only be obviated by removing the children from Mother's custody.

For the foregoing reasons, Mother has failed to establish a valid basis for reversing the dispositional orders.

IV

DISPOSITION

The jurisdictional and dispositional orders are affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

CODRINGTON
J.

We concur:

McKINSTER
Acting P. J.

MENETREZ
J.